



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,309	02/28/2002	Jean-Francois Kummel	145.002	7609

7590 04/27/2006

Timothy E. Newholm
BOYLE FREDRICKSON NEWHOLM STEIN & GRATZ S.C.
250 Plaza, Suite 1030
250 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202

EXAMINER

TUGBANG, ANTHONY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/085,309	Applicant(s) KUMMEL, JEAN-FRANCOIS	
	Examiner A. Dexter Tugbang	Art Unit 3729	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) A. Dexter Tugbang, Examiner.

(3) Timothy E. Newholm, for Applicant(s).

(2) Peter J. Bausch, for Applicant(s).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 April 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Billings et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant(s) initiated this interview to discuss a proposed after final amendment, which is attached herein. The examiner noted that while the amendment appears to overcome the prior art, the new limitations added (at lines 10-11 of the proposed after final amendment) would raise new issues, requiring further consideration and search. The examiner requested any subsequent response be filed formally for consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


A. DEXTER TUGBANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Jodi A. Calderon

Date _____

Attorney Docket No. 145.002

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Jean-Francois Kummel

Art Unit: 3729

Serial No. 10/085,309

Examiner: A. Dexter Tugbang

Filed: February 28, 2002

Confirmation No.: 7609

For: *Inductive Component and Manufacturing Process for Such a Component*

DRAFT AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed February 15, 2006, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 4.

Remarks/Arguments

Entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7-10 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

1. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Billings et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,745,388 ('388 patent) is respectfully traversed, because, *inter alia*, independent claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, results in subject matter not disclosed in the '388 patent.

Specifically, as amended, the method of claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, that a body formed from a block of insulating material be formed by overmoulding the insulating material over the coil and that the overmoulding step is performed after formation of the flat coil.

- Applicant maintains that the '388 does *not* include any block of insulating material that is formed into a body on the coil and connecting terminals by overmoulding the insulating material onto the coils and connecting terminals as required by claim 1.
- However, in order to expedite prosecution applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that the overmoulding step is performed after formation of the flat coil. The bobbin assembly 14 in the '388 patent is not overmoulded over a flat coil as claimed. In addition, the primary and secondary windings 28 and 32 are wound around the hub 16 of the bobbin 14 only after the bobbin 14 is formed. See Col. 2, lines 7-22.

3. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The rejection of claims 4 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '388 patent in view of Yanase et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,370,292 ('292 patent) is respectfully

traversed, because, inter alia, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine or modify the references to produce the claimed invention.

Each of claims 4 and 7-10 depend ultimately from claim 1 and consequently includes all of the limitations found in claim 1. As discussed previously concerning the rejection of claim 1, the '388 patent fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1, specifically the step of overmoulding a body formed from a block of an insulating material onto the flat coil and onto the connecting terminal after formation of the flat coil. As a result, because the '388 patent and the '292 patent fail to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 1, from which each of claims 4 and 7-10 depend, these prior art references also fail to disclose each of the elements of claims 4 and 7-10. In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 4 and 7-10 is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/085,309 to Kummel
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006
Art Unit: 3729
Page 2

Amendments to the Claims

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (currently amended) A process of manufacturing an inductive component intended to be installed on a printed circuit and including at least one winding and a magnetic core, the process comprising:
 - winding a wire having ends to form a winding in the form of a flat coil, the winding step being performed without using a former;
 - connecting the ends of the winding to inner ends of connecting terminals;
 - overmoulding a body from a block of an insulating material onto the coil and onto the inner ends of the connecting terminals so that a lower face of the body is at least generally orthogonal to an axis of the coil, the body including a central opening formed therethrough which passes along the axis of the coil said overmoulding step being performed after formation of the flat coil; and
 - placing a core made of ferrite on the body such that the core surrounds the body in a center plane containing the axis of the coil and has a center core element passing through the opening of the body.

Claim 2 (withdrawn)

3. (original) A process according to claim 1, further comprising bonding the coil to a grid that has the connecting terminals formed thereon.

Serial No. 10/085,309 to Kummel
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006
Art Unit: 3729
Page 3

4. (original) A process in accordance with claim 1, wherein the core comprises core elements bonded to each other with a non-magnetic adhesive.

Claims 5–6 (withdrawn)

7. (original) A process in accordance with claim 1, wherein the step of overmoulding is performed via an injection process using a thermoplastic polymer.

8. (original) A process in accordance with claim 7, wherein, during the injection process, the thermoplastic polymer is injected at a temperature higher than 300° C.

9. (original) A process in accordance with claim 7, wherein, during the injection process, the injection pressure ranges from to 40 to 60 bars.

10. (original) A process in accordance with claim 7, wherein the injection cycle time of the injection process is less than 15 seconds.

Claims 11–17 (withdrawn)

Serial No. 10/085,309 to Kummel
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2006
Art Unit: 3729
Page 6

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is believed to be in prima facie condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it would help expedite the prosecution and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 19, 2006

Timothy E. Newholm
Reg. No. 34,400

USPTO Customer No. 23,598

Boyle Fredrickson Newholm Stein & Gratz, S.C.
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: (414) 225-9755
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753